

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN  
GREEN BAY DIVISION

---

Kimberly-Clark Worldwide, Inc., and  
Kimberly-Clark Global Sales, LLC,

Plaintiffs,

Civil Action No. 09-CV-0916  
Consolidated with Civil Action  
No. 10-CV-1118)

v.

Judge William C. Griesbach

First Quality Baby Products, LLC,  
First Quality Retail Services, LLC, and  
First Quality Consumer Products, LLC,

Defendants.

---

**FIRST QUALITY'S CROSS-MOTION FOR FAST TRACK SUMMARY JUDGMENT  
THAT U.S. PATENT NO. 6,885,451 IS INVALID**

---

Defendants First Quality Baby Products, LLC, First Quality Retail Services, LLC and First Quality Consumer Products, LLC (“First Quality”) respectfully cross-move this Court to enter Summary Judgment that U.S. Patent No. 6,885,451 (“the ‘451 Patent”) is invalid.

If the Asserted Claims of the ‘451 Patent are construed to cover an inspection system and method that detects visible light, as K-C does to assert that First Quality infringes, there are multiple grounds under which the ‘451 Patent is invalid:

First, under this construction, as demonstrated in First Quality’s Memorandum filed in Support of this Motion and First Quality’s Opposition to K-C’s Motion for Fast Track Summary Judgment that the ‘451 Patent Is Not Anticipated By U.S. Pat. No. 5,359,525, each of Asserted Claims 1, 3-4, 9, and 11-12 of the ‘451 Patent are anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) by U.S. Patent No. 5,359,525 to Weyenberg. The only distinction that K-C draws between the Asserted Claims and the Weyenberg Patent is based on its argument that Weyenberg fails to disclose “first and second panels in at least partially overlapping engagement with each other.” The evidence establishes that K-C is wrong. The Weyenberg Patent discloses each and every claim limitation of the Asserted Claims of K-C’s ‘451 Patent. Accordingly, the Court should grant Summary Judgment that the Asserted Claims of ‘451 Patent are anticipated by the Weyenberg Patent.

Second, the Asserted Claims of the ‘451 Patent are also invalid for failure to satisfy the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112. In particular, as demonstrated in First Quality’s Memorandum filed in Support of this Motion, and as admitted by K-C, the disclosure of the ‘451 Patent is limited to *infrared* detection. However, the claim language, on its face, is not so limited. To the extent the Asserted Claims are read so broadly so as to include the detection of visible and/or ultra-violet light, a straightforward application of the case law to these undisputed facts compels the conclusion that these claims are invalid as a matter of law for failure to satisfy Section 112.

In the alternative, should the Court wish to construe the asserted claims to preserve their validity, the asserted claims must be construed as limited to the use of *infrared* radiation detection to inspect panels that are substantially opaque to visible and/or ultraviolet light.

Accordingly, for these reasons, the Court should grant Summary Judgment that the '451 Patent is invalid.

Dated: August 17, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

s/ Michael J. Kasdan

Kenneth P. George  
Ira E. Silfin  
Michael V. Solomita  
Brian A. Comack  
Michael J. Kasdan  
AMSTER ROTHSTEIN & EBENSTEIN LLP  
90 Park Avenue  
New York, NY 10016  
Phone: (212) 336-8000  
Email: [kgeorge@arelaw.com](mailto:kgeorge@arelaw.com)  
[isilfin@arelaw.com](mailto:isilfin@arelaw.com)  
[msolomita@arelaw.com](mailto:msolomita@arelaw.com)  
[bcomack@arelaw.com](mailto:bcomack@arelaw.com)  
[mkasdan@arelaw.com](mailto:mkasdan@arelaw.com)

*and*

Gregory B. Conway  
T. Wickham Schmidt  
LIEBMANN, CONWAY, OLEJNICZAK &  
JERRY, S.C.  
231 South Adams Street  
Green Bay, WI 54301  
Phone: (920) 437-0476  
Email: [gbc@lcojlaw.com](mailto:gbc@lcojlaw.com)  
[tws@lcojlaw.com](mailto:tws@lcojlaw.com)

*and*

D. Michael Underhill  
Michael A. Brille  
BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP  
5301 Wisconsin Avenue, NW, 8th Fl.  
Washington, DC 20015  
Phone: (202) 237-2727  
Email: [munderhill@bsfllp.com](mailto:munderhill@bsfllp.com)  
[mbrille@bsfllp.com](mailto:mbrille@bsfllp.com)

ATTORNEYS FOR  
DEFENDANTS/COUNTERCLAIM-PLAINTIFFS  
FIRST QUALITY BABY PRODUCTS, LLC,  
FIRST QUALITY RETAIL SERVICES, LLC,  
AND FIRST QUALITY CONSUMER  
PRODUCTS, LLC